

REMARKS

This amendment is further to the response filed on May 15, 2006 in response to the Final Office Action dated December 2, 2005.

This amendment has been drafted as if the amendment filed May 15, 2006 has not yet been entered and should be considered a substitute therefore. The substantive difference between the two amendments is the insertion of new step (b) in claim 1. The remaining claims are submitted as previously submitted on May 15, 2006.

By said Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5, 11 and 15-16 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement and written description requirement.

In a telephone interview graciously granted by the Examiner and his supervisor David Fox, Applicant proposed the amendments to claims 1, 15 and 16 above, with claims 1, 2, 11, 15 and 16 remaining in the application.

In said interview, the Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments appeared to put the application in allowable condition, and requested formal submission of the amendments.

Support for claims amendments (according to the published PCT WO 01/13708)**Claim 1:**

"Hirsutum" can be found throughout the application e.g., Page 5 line 31.

"such that the fruit remains of the vine of said hybrid plants past the normal red ripe harvest stage" can be found in Page 6 lines 7-8.

"self-crossing and/or back crossing" can be found throughout the application, such as at Page 5, lines 7 and 19.

Claims 15 and 16:

"genome" is supported by "genetic makeup" in Page 2 line 26.

"introgression" is supported as the outcome of classical genetic breeding techniques and molecular genetic techniques described in Page 2 lines 30-31.

4

In view thereof, the allowance of claims 1, 2, 11, 15 and 16 is deemed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin D. Moynihan,
Registration No. 40,338

May 18, 2006